therefore, a certificate of appealability is denied. See 28 U.S.C.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 AURELIO MARTIN SEPULVEDA, CASE NO. ED CV 15-255-CAS (PJW)) 11 Petitioner, ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND ADOPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, 12 AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED v. STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE, AND DANIEL PARAMO, WARDEN, 13 DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY 14 Respondent. 15 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 636, the Court has reviewed the 16 17 Petition, records on file, and the Report and Recommendation of the 18 United States Magistrate Judge. Further, the Court has engaged in a 19 de novo review of those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. The Court accepts the Report and adopts the findings, 20 21 conclusions, and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. 22 Further, for the reasons stated in the Report and 23 Recommendation, the Court finds that Petitioner has not made a 24 substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right and

25

26

27

28

Case 5:15-cv-00255-CAS-PJW Document 17 Filed 03/16/16 Page 2 of 2 Page ID #:254

§ 2253(c)(2); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b); Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003). March 16, 2016 DATED: Rhristine a. Smyde UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE